

### **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 2, 7-12, 14, and 19-25 are allowable if rewritten into independent form. In view of the following remarks, all claims are believed to be allowable. Accordingly, rewriting these claims into independent form is deferred at this time.

#### **I. Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 5-14, and 17-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, and 25 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 13, and 25. Claims 1, 2, 5, 11-14, 17, and 23-25 have been amended by this reply. No new matter has been introduced by way of these amendments.

#### **II. Claim Objection**

Claims 5 and 17 were objected to because these claims depended from claims, which have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 5 and 17 have been amended to correct this error in dependency. In view of the amendment, Applicant believes this objection to be moot.

#### **III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C § 112**

Claims 1, 2, 5-14, and 17-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite, because of the use of the term “the electric potential.” Claims 1, 13, and 25 have been amended in this reply to clarify the present invention. In view of the amendment, Applicant believes this

rejection to be moot. However, to the extent that this rejection may still apply, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 13, and 25 have been amended to remove the term “electric potential” and replace with “a voltage value.” Further, the limitation “by said analysis point” was added to clarify the “location” of the change. In particular, in connection with the step of generating a list of faulty locations, the electric potential refers to a voltage value, which is changed by an analysis point, *e.g.*, a logic gate, a signal line, or a path of propagating signal, *etc.*, in accordance with changes in the supplied test patterns.

In view of these amendments, claims 1, 13, and 25 are clearly defined. Claims 2, 5-13, and 17-24 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 13, and 25, and thus, these claims are likewise definite for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C § 102**

Claims 1, 6, 13, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,246,248 (“Yamagishi”). Claims 1 and 13 have been amended in this reply to clarify the present invention. Additionally, claims 2 and 14 have also been amended to correct antecedent basis in accordance with the amendments to claims 1 and 13, respectively. In particular, claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include the limitation, “a pulse width.” In view of the amendment, Applicant believes this rejection to be moot. However, to the extent that this rejection may still apply, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has indicated (on page 5 of the Action) that Yamagishi does not disclose, “wherein the transient power supply current tester determine that said transient power supply

current is abnormal when said pulse width of the transient power supply is over a predetermined value,” as recited in claim 2. Therefore, similarly, Yamagishi also does not disclose the step of “measuring a pulse width of a transient power supply current generated on said semiconductor IC...,” as now recited in amended claims 1 and 13.

Moreover, Yamagishi discloses, “a current detection circuit 170 takes measurements of a voltage between opposite ends of the detection resistor 3, thereby detecting a voltage value proportional to a current value of the power supply current flowing through the DUT 1,” (col. 4, ll. 63-67). In other words, Yamagishi discloses a frequency spectrum relating to a change of current value of the power supply, rather than “measuring a pulse width of a transient power supply,” as recited in amended claims 1 and 13.

In view of the above, Yamagishi fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the claims as amended. Thus, amended claims 1 and 13 are patentable over Yamagishi. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 02008/071001; AD-0243PCTUS).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/6/2003

Jonathan P. Osha, Reg. No. 33,986  
*Jonathan P. Osha, Reg. No. 33,986*  
Rosenthal & Osha L.L.P.  
One Houston Center, Suite 2800  
1221 McKinney Street  
Houston, TX 77010  
Telephone: (713) 228-8600  
Facsimile: (713) 228-8778